

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001	03 MDL 1570 (GBD)(SN)
-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------

This document relates to:

Roberta Agyeman, et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 1:18-cv-05320 (GBD)(SN)

Nicole Amato, et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 1:21-cv-10239 (GBD)(SN)

Susan M. King, et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 1:22-cv-05193 (GBD)(SN)

Justin Strauss, et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 1:22-cv-10823 (GBD)(SN)

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL
FINAL DAMAGES JUDGMENT ON BEHALF OF MOVING PLAINTIFFS**

ANDERSON KILL P.C.
Jerry S. Goldman, Esq.
Bruce E. Strong, Esq.
Alexander Greene, Esq.
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Tel: (212) 278-1000
Fax: (212) 278-1733
Email: jgoldman@andersonkill.com
bstrong@andersonkill.com
agreene@andersonkill.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Dated: New York, New York
May 31, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	2
A. Orders	2
B. Related Cases.....	3
C. <i>O’Neill</i> Plaintiffs Herein – Service and Liability	5
III. DAMAGES – GOVERNING LAW	6
A. Background.....	6
B. Solatium Damages.....	7
C. Pain and Suffering Damages For Estates	10
D. Economic Damages For Estates	10
E. Punitive Damages.....	12
F. Prejudgment Interest.....	13
IV. CONCLUSION	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ashton v. al Qaeda Islamic Army</i> , 02-CV-6977 (GBD)(SN)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Baker v. Socialist People’s Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</i> , 775 F. Supp. 2d 48 (D.D.C. 2011)	13
<i>Bauer v. Al Qaeda Islamic Army</i> , 02-CV-7236 (GBD)(SN)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Belkin v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 667 F. Supp. 2d 8 (D.D.C. 2009)	8
<i>Dammarell v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 281 F. Supp. 2d 105 (D.D.C. 2003), <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 404 F. Supp. 2d 261 (D.D.C. 2005)	8
<i>Est. of Bland v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 831 F. Supp. 2d 150 (D.D.C. 2011)	8
<i>Est. of Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 466 F. Supp. 2d 229 (D.D.C. 2006)	4, 8
<i>Flatow v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 999 F. Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1998)	10
<i>Roth v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 78 F. Supp. 3d 379 (D.D.C. 2015)	10
<i>In re Sept. 11 Litig.</i> , 802 F.3d 314 (2d Cir. 2015)	15
<i>Surette v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 231 F. Supp. 2d 260 (D.D.C. 2002)	8
<i>Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 700 F. Supp. 2d 52 (D.D.C. 2010)	8, 10
Statutes	
28 U.S.C. § 1605A	<i>passim</i>
Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act (“ATSSSA”). Pub. L. No. 107-42, 115 Stat. 230 (2001) (codified as amended at 49 U.S.C. § 40101)	14

I. INTRODUCTION

For the reasons set forth below, the statements contained in the Declaration of Jerry S. Goldman, Esq., with exhibits appended thereto and tendered under seal (“Goldman Declaration”), which is being filed contemporaneously with this memorandum of law, as well as those set forth in prior motions for liability and damages made on behalf of the *O’Neill* plaintiffs, certain plaintiffs in the above-referenced matters who are identified in Exhibit A and Exhibit B,¹ annexed to the Goldman Declaration (the plaintiffs in Exhibit A and Exhibit B are the “Moving Plaintiffs”) (which are Exhibit B and Exhibit C to the Proposed Order), by and through their counsel, Anderson Kill P.C., respectfully move this Court for an Order:

(1) awarding the Moving Plaintiff identified in Exhibit A a damages judgment against the Islamic Republic of Iran (“Iran”) in the same amount previously awarded by this Court to various similarly situated plaintiffs in *Burnett*, *Havlish*, *Ashton*, *Bauer*, *O’Neill*, and other cases; AND,

(2) awarding solatium damages in the amount of \$12,500,000 to the Moving Plaintiff identified in Exhibit A, as set forth in annexed Exhibit A; AND,

(3) awarding the estates of the 9/11 decedents, through their personal representatives and on behalf of all survivors and all legally entitled beneficiaries and family members of such 9/11 decedent, as identified in Exhibit B, an award of economic damages in the amounts set forth in Exhibit B; AND,

¹ The plaintiffs listed in annexed Exhibit B are personal representatives of 9/11 decedent estates. They are submitting claims for compensatory damages as a result of the 9/11 decedent’s death. As noted below, each personal representative has provided the undersigned counsel with proof that he or she has been appointed by the court as the personal representative of the decedent. Goldman Declaration at ¶ 8.

(4) awarding the Moving Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A and Exhibit B prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the damages judgment; AND,

(5) granting the Moving Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A and Exhibit B permission to seek punitive damages, economic damages, and other appropriate damages, at a later date, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed; AND,

(6) granting permission for all other Plaintiffs in these actions not appearing in Exhibit A and Exhibit B to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed; AND,

(7) granting to the Moving Plaintiffs in Exhibit A and Exhibit B such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper.

II. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

A. Orders

This motion is being submitted in accordance with various procedural orders entered by this Court, and the form of this motion and the relief requested herein are intended to comply with various orders of this Court, including the following:

- a. The Court's January 24, 2017 Order, ECF No. 3435,² requiring that "[a]ll further motions for final judgment against any defaulting defendant shall be accompanied by a sworn declaration attesting that the attorney has (1) complied with the due diligence safeguards [referenced in Section II.D. of the January 23, 2017 letter from the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee (ECF No. 3433)] and (2) personally verified that no relief has previously been awarded to any plaintiff included in the judgment (or, if relief has been awarded, the nature of that relief)."
- b. The Court's October 14, 2016 Order, ECF No. 3363, concerning the amounts of solatium damage awards.

² All ECF numbers are to the MDL docket unless stated otherwise.

- c. The Court's October 14, 2016 Order, ECF No. 3362, related to the cases captioned as *Bauer v. Al Qaeda Islamic Army*, 02-CV-7236 (GBD)(SN) and *Ashton v. al Qaeda Islamic Army*, 02-CV-6977 (GBD)(SN).
- d. The Court's October 28, 2019 Order, ECF No. 5234, setting forth updated procedural rules.
- e. The Court's October 28, 2019 Order, ECF No. 5338, setting forth the scheduling order.
- f. The Court's May 5, 2022 Order, ECF No. 7963, setting forth procedures for filing expert reports submitted in support of default judgments.
- g. The Court's September 22, 2023 Order, ECF No. 9355, setting forth procedures for default judgment motions.

B. Related Cases

Relying on evidence and arguments³ submitted by plaintiffs in *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001*, 03-md-1570, the consolidated multidistrict litigation arising out of the September 11th Attacks, this Court on December 22, 2011, and again on August 31, 2015, granted Orders of Judgment on Liability in favor of certain of the *Havlish*, *Ashton*, *O'Neill*, *Federal Insurance*, and *Hoglan* groups of plaintiffs against Iran. *See, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 2516, 3014, 3016, 3020-23. Subsequently, other liability findings were made for additional *O'Neill* Plaintiffs. After granting the *Havlish* Order of Default Judgment on Liability, this Court considered the issue of damages suffered by the *Havlish* plaintiffs and their decedents. Upon the submissions of the *Havlish* plaintiffs, on October 3, 2012, this Court found, among other things, that "Plaintiffs may recover for [, inter alia,] solatium . . . in an action under Section 1605A. 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c)(4). In such an action, . . . family members can recover solatium for their

³ In each of the Orders of Judgment regarding plaintiffs' claims against Iran in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation, the Court premised its determination "[u]pon consideration of the evidence submitted by the Plaintiffs in filings with this Court on May 19, 2011, July 13, 2011, and August 19, 2011, and the evidence presented at the December 15, 2011, hearing on liability, together with the entire record in this case." ECF Nos. 2516, 3014, 3016, 3020-22; *see also* ECF No. 3023 (substantially similar language).

emotional injury; and all plaintiffs can recover punitive damages.” ECF No. 2623 at 2-3, quoting *Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 700 F. Supp. 2d 52, 83 (D.D.C. 2010). This Court also found that the following solatium awards for family members are appropriate, as an upward departure from the framework in *Est. of Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 466 F. Supp. 2d 229 (D.D.C. 2006).

Relationship of Decedent	Solatium Award
Spouse	\$12,500,000
Parent	\$8,500,000
Child	\$8,500,000
Sibling	\$4,250,000

ECF No. 2623 at 4.

The Court has applied the same solatium values to claims of other solatium plaintiffs in *Burnett* (ECF Nos. 3666, 4023, 4126, 4146, 4175, 5061, 5062, 5087, 5138, and 5356) and other solatium plaintiffs in other cases coordinated in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation. *See, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 3175 at 2, 3300 at 1, 3358 at 9, 3363 at 16, 3399, and 3977 at 7.

In that same decision in *Havlish*, this Court also found that Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages under the FSIA in an amount of 3.44 multiplied by their compensatory damages award. ECF No. 2623 at 5. The Court has applied that 3.44 multiplier also to judgments in *Ashton*. *See* ECF No. 3175 at 3 (Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 punitive multiplier); *see also* ECF No. 3229 at 1 (Order adopting in its entirety Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 punitive multiplier). The Court applied the 3.44 punitive multiplier to the compensatory awards previously awarded in *Burnett*. ECF No. 3666. However,

in *Hoglan*, another case in this multidistrict litigation, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the plaintiffs' request for punitive damages be denied without prejudice. ECF Nos. 3358 at 11-16, 3363 at 28. Judge Daniels adopted Magistrate Judge Netburn's Report and Recommendation in its entirety. ECF Nos. 3383 at 2, 3384 at 6.

In the *Havlish* decision, this Court also found that prejudgment interest was warranted for the Plaintiffs' solatium damages. ECF No. 2623 at 5. The *Havlish* plaintiffs sought application of a 4.96% interest rate, which the magistrate judge recommended (ECF No. 2619 at 13-14) and Judge Daniels adopted (ECF No. 2623 at 5). In *Ashton*, plaintiffs sought, and the magistrate judge recommended, application of a statutory nine percent simple interest rate for prejudgment interest. ECF No. 3175 at 7-8. Judge Daniels adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and applied the nine percent interest rate in multiple instances in *Ashton* and *Bauer*. See ECF Nos. 3229 at 2, 3300 at 1, 3341 at 1. However, in *Hoglan*, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the 4.96 percent rate for prejudgment interest should be applied to all solatium claims, ECF Nos. 3358 at 17-20, 3363 at 28-29. Judge Daniels adopted Magistrate Judge Netburn's *Hoglan* Report and Recommendation in its entirety and applied an interest rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually. ECF Nos. 3383 at 2, 3384 at 6. The Court applied that interest rate, 4.96 percent per annum, to the awards to other plaintiffs in *Burnett*.

C. Moving Plaintiffs – Service and Liability

As set forth in Exhibit A to the Proposed Order, Moving Plaintiffs herein filed suit and duly served Iran. The Clerk's Office, upon Plaintiffs' applications, issued Clerk's Certificates of Default, and liability judgments have been entered in these cases.

III. Damages – Governing Law

A. Background

Section 1605A of the FSIA permits a foreign state to be held accountable for acts of terrorism or the provision of material support or resources for acts of terrorism where the acts or provision of support or resources were engaged in by an official, employee, or agent of the foreign state while acting within the scope of his or her office, employment, or agency. 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(a)(1). The statute specifies that damages are available “for personal injury or death,” § 1605A(a)(1) and (c)(4), and include “economic damages, solatium, pain and suffering, and punitive damages.” § 1605A(c)(4). Courts addressing the damages available under the statute have held that, among other damages recoverable, “family members [or the functional equivalents of such family members] can recover solatium for their emotional injury; and all plaintiffs can recover punitive damages.” ECF No. 2623 at 2-3 (quoting *Valore*, 700 F. Supp. 2d at 83).

The Moving Plaintiff identified in annexed Exhibit A is the estate of a spouse of an individual who was killed on 9/11, as demonstrated by documentary evidence of their familial relationship to a 9/11 decedent, such as a marriage certificate, sworn affidavits, official documents, or other documents signed under penalty of perjury, which attest to a familial relationship eligible for recovery, and, in the case of a subsequently deceased family member, a death certificate or sworn affidavit which reflects that the claimant did not predecease the 9/11 victim.⁴ See Goldman Declaration at ¶ 6.

⁴ Such evidence is consistent with that contemplated in the Court’s July 10, 2018 Order at ECF No. 4045.

Moving Plaintiffs identified in annexed Exhibit B are comprised of the estates of victims who perished on 9/11, in claims asserted by their personal representatives, as demonstrated by documentary evidence in the form of official documents from probate and administration proceedings from Surrogate's Court, Probate Court, Orphan's Court, and similar judicial bodies. *See* Goldman Declaration at ¶¶ 7-9.

With respect to each estate plaintiff (in both annexed Exhibit A and Exhibit B), the personal representative has provided the undersigned counsel with proof that he or she has been appointed by the court as the personal representative of the deceased relative and/or 9/11 decedent estate.

As liability has been established in this matter, each Moving Plaintiff is now entitled to damages in the amounts set forth in annexed Exhibit A and Exhibit B, which reflect the damage amounts previously established and applied by this Court in this and other related cases arising from the terrorists attacks on September 11, 2001 (the "9/11 Attacks") or based upon expert economic reports submitted herewith. In accordance with the terms of the FSIA, the Moving Plaintiffs with liability entered are entitled to compensation under Section 1605A for their solatium, and economic damages, as applicable, and are also entitled to prejudgment interest. Finally, each moving 9/11 decedent estate who has tendered an expert economic report at this time, as identified herein, in the Goldman Declaration, and in annexed Exhibit B, are entitled to economic damages.

B. Solatium Damages

As set forth above, the FSIA specifically provides for an award of solatium damages. Under § 1605A, family members of a decedent may recover for "the mental anguish, bereavement, and grief that those with a close relationship to the decedent experience as a result of the decedent's death, as well as the harm caused by the loss of decedent's society and

comfort.” *Dammarell v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 281 F. Supp. 2d 105, 196 (D.D.C. 2003), *vacated on other grounds*, 404 F. Supp. 2d 261 (D.D.C. 2005). Other courts have previously noted that “[a]cts of terrorism are by their very definition extreme and outrageous and intended to cause the highest degree of emotional distress.” *Belkin v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 667 F. Supp. 2d 8, 22 (D.D.C. 2009). In cases brought under this exception to the FSIA, solatium claims have been treated as analogous to claims for the intentional infliction of emotional distress. *See, e.g., Surette v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 231 F. Supp. 2d 260, 267 n.5 (D.D.C. 2002) (treating solatium claim as “‘indistinguishable’ from the claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress” (quoting *Wagner v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 172 F. Supp. 2d 128, 135 n.11 (D.D.C. 2001))).

When previously awarding solatium damages in other cases related to the 9/11 Attacks, such as those noted above, this Court looked at the framework established by District Court Judge Royce C. Lamberth in *Heiser*, 466 F. Supp. 2d at 229, where the court awarded solatium damages to each spouse of a deceased victim in the amount of \$8 million, to each parent in the amount of \$5 million, and to each sibling in the amount of \$2.5 million. *Id.* This formula, however, may be adjusted upward or downward when circumstances warrant. *See, e.g., Est. of Bland v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 831 F. Supp. 2d 150, 156 (D.D.C. 2011); *Valore*, 700 F. Supp. 2d at 85.

Analyzing the solatium claims of the families of the *Havlish* victims who perished in the 9/11 Attacks, Magistrate Judge Maas concluded that an upward departure from Judge Lamberth’s framework in *Heiser* was appropriate because the decedents’ immediate family members suffered, and continue to suffer “profound agony and grief” and “[w]orse yet, ...are faced with frequent reminders of the events of that day.” ECF No. 2618 at 10-12. Judge Maas

noted in his July 30, 2012 Report and Recommendation the “extraordinarily tragic circumstances surrounding the September 11th attacks, and their indelible impact on the lives of the victims’ families . . .” *Id.* at 11. In that Report and Recommendation, with which this Court later agreed, Magistrate Judge Maas recommended that solatium damages be awarded to the immediate family members of the victims of the 9/11 Attacks in the following amounts:

Relationship of Decedent	Solatium Award
Spouse	\$12,500,000
Parent	\$8,500,000
Child	\$8,500,000
Sibling	\$4,250,000

Id. at 11.

These exact amounts were adopted by this Court in its October 3, 2012 Order, ECF No. 2623, and were replicated in this Court’s June 16, 2016 Order relating to the claims of certain of the *Ashton* Plaintiffs, ECF No. 3300, in the September 12, 2016 Order pertaining to plaintiffs in *Bauer*, ECF No. 3341, in the October 14, 2016 Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 3363, and in the October 31, 2016 Order in *Hoglan*, ECF No. 3384. These amounts were, again, adopted by this Court in its April 24, 2018 Order relating to the claims of additional *Ashton* plaintiffs, ECF No. 3977 at 6–7. The same amounts were recently adopted in the Court’s June 8, 2018 (Corrected) Order of Partial Final Default Judgment in the matter known as “*Burnett/Iran II*,” No. 15-cv-09903, ECF No. 101.⁵

⁵ The same values were applied to the claims of other plaintiffs in the earlier *Burnett* case in this Court’s July 31, 2017 Order, ECF No. 3666, are in other filings of the *Burnett*, *Ashton*, and *O’Neill* plaintiffs.

The solatium loss suffered by the Moving Plaintiff in Exhibit A is legally and factually comparable to the solatium loss suffered by the plaintiffs in *Havlish*, *Ashton*, *Bauer*, *Hoglan*, *O'Neill*, and *Burnett*. As such, the Moving Plaintiff identified in annexed Exhibit A respectfully requests that the Court grant an award of solatium damages in the amount of \$12,500,000 as indicated in annexed Exhibit A, consistent with this Court's application of those values established and applied in *Havlish*, and subsequently adopted and applied to plaintiffs in the *Ashton*, *Bauer*, *Hoglan*, *O'Neill*, and *Burnett* cases.

C. Economic Damages For Estates

The FSIA specifically provides for economic damages. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c). The economic damages provision is “designed to compensate [a] decedent’s heirs-at-law for economic losses which result from [the] decedent’s premature death.” *Flatow v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 999 F. Supp. 1, 27 (D.D.C. 1998). Accordingly, “the beneficiaries of each decedent’s estate [are]...entitled to recover the present value of economic damages, including lost wages that the decedents might reasonably have been expected to earn but for their wrongful deaths.” *Valore*, 700 F. Supp. 2d at 81-82 (D.D.C. 2010), citing *Heiser*, 466 F.Supp.2d at 229. Thus, for example, United States District Court Judge Royce C. Lamberth, in a series of decisions issuing final judgments Iran under the FSIA, has held Iran “liable for the economic damages caused to decedents’ estates.” *Roth v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 78 F. Supp. 3d 379, 399-400 (D.D.C. 2015), quoting *Valore*, 700 F.Supp.2d at 78.⁶

⁶ In adopting this estate-accumulations calculation, Judge Lamberth recognized that case law under the FSIA was “develop[ing]...a federal standard” and looked to the law of the District of Columbia, which it concluded was “an appropriate model” to adopt and which calculated economic damages as the loss of accretions to the decedent’s estate. *Valore*, 700 F.Supp. 2d at 82.

Previously, this Court awarded economic damages in prior Iran cases for the “economic losses stemming from the wrongful death of the decedent[.]” *See* ECF No. 2623 at 2-3. In doing so, it adopted the economic loss calculations set forth in the plaintiffs’ economic expert reports.

Certain of the estates set forth in annexed Exhibit B and as specifically identified and set forth therein,⁷ and which provided economic expert reports, transmitted to the Court in the Goldman Declaration, seek economic damages, similar to the plaintiffs in the prior Iran cases in this Court under the standards set in the District of Columbia cases cited herein. Goldman Declaration at ¶¶ 21-28.

As described at length in the Goldman Declaration, in these cases, plaintiffs retained the services of an expert, John F. Beazile, who possesses a Master’s Degree in Actuarial Science from Columbia University (“Expert”), to evaluate the economic losses resulting from decedent’s death as a result of the 9/11 Attacks. Goldman Declaration at ¶¶ 24-28.

As described in more detail in the Goldman Declaration, and the Expert’s Declaration (which is Exhibit C to the Goldman Declaration), we obtained, generally through a Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) request, entire September 11th Victim Compensation Fund (“VCF”) files for a substantial number of the *O’Neill* plaintiffs.⁸ Those files, along with other materials provided by the clients, contained various economic expert reports, VCF applications, VCF work papers and distribution plans, VCF determinations, underlying economic documents, and the like. Using methodology and assumptions described in his declaration, relying on earlier expert reports, determinations by the VCF, and other documents, the Expert prepared up-to-date

⁷ The estate referenced in annexed Exhibit A is the estate of a spouse of a 9/11 decedent, who passed away in the years following the September 11th attacks, as opposed to the estates of the 9/11 decedents who are listed in annexed Exhibit B.

⁸ We are still awaiting receipt of additional files which has adversely become impacted by both “normal” delays in receiving responses to FOIA requests and COVID.

economic loss expert reports, copies of which are deemed appended to the Expert's Declaration (Exhibit C) and being filed on ECF with access restricted to the Court pursuant to the Court's May 5, 2022 Order, ECF No. 7963, setting forth procedures for filing expert reports ("Expert Reports") in support of default judgments.

Based on the foregoing, the Moving Plaintiffs respectfully ask that this Court award economic damages to the estates set forth in annexed Exhibit B in the amounts stated therein, as supported by the Expert Reports.

D. Punitive Damages

Moving Plaintiffs are also entitled to punitive damages under the FSIA. 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c)(4). In the *Havlish* Report and Recommendation on damages, the magistrate judge explained that a "3.44 ratio 'has been established as the standard ratio applicable to cases arising out of' terrorist attacks." ECF No. 2618 at 13 (quoting *Est. of Bland v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 831 F. Supp. 2d 150, 158 (D.D.C. 2011)). This Court adopted that recommendation and awarded punitive damages on each compensatory damages category at a ratio of 3.44 (punitive) to 1 (compensatory). ECF No. 2623 at 2. The Court has applied that ratio to awards for plaintiffs in other related cases. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 3175 at 3 (Magistrate Judge Maas Report and Recommendation to apply a 3.44 punitive multiplier); ECF No. 3229 at 1 (Judge Daniels adopting in its entirety Judge Maas's Report and Recommendation to apply a 3.44 multiplier); ECF No. 3300 at 1 and Exhibit A (Judge Daniels applying 3.44 punitive multiplier to claims in *Ashton*).

However, in *Hoglan*, another case in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the plaintiffs' request for punitive damages be denied without prejudice. ECF No. 3363 at 28. Judge Daniels adopted

Magistrate Judge Netburn's Report in its entirety, denying without prejudice the plaintiffs' request for punitive damages. ECF No. 3384 at 6.

In light of the Court's decision in related litigation to defer determination of punitive damage issues until a later stage of the litigation, Moving Plaintiffs herein request permission to address the issue of punitive damages at a later date. *See, e.g.,* ECF No. 3666 (Judge Daniels' Order in *Burnett* authorizing plaintiffs to make an application for punitive damages at a later date consistent with any future rulings of the Court).

E. Prejudgment Interest

An award of prejudgment interest is within the sound discretion of a trial court and is warranted when plaintiffs are delayed in recovering compensation for non-economic injuries caused by acts of terrorism. *See Baker v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*, 775 F. Supp. 2d 48, 86 (D.D.C. 2011). This Court awarded the *Havlish* plaintiffs prejudgment interest at a rate of 4.96% on their pain and suffering damages awards, to be calculated from September 11, 2001, until the date of judgment. ECF No. 2618 at 13-14. This Court, recognizing that prejudgment interest was appropriate in cases such as these cases, adopted the magistrate judge's reasoning, finding that an award of prejudgment interest was appropriate and accepting the rate of 4.96%, as proposed by the *Havlish* plaintiffs' expert.

After the *Havlish* award, plaintiffs in *Ashton* and *Bauer* proposed, and the Court agreed, that prejudgment simple interest at the New York State statutory rate of nine percent per annum was appropriate in cases where the injuries arose in New York and the prejudgment interest used in *Havlish*, 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually, should be reserved for only those cases where the injuries arose in other states. *See* ECF Nos. 3229 at 2, 3300 at 1, 3341 at 1.

The Second Circuit has held that New York State's statutory prejudgment interest rate should apply to the damages awarded to World Trade Center complex leaseholders in their

litigation against American Airlines and United Airlines brought under the federal Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act (“ATSSSA”). Pub. L. No. 107-42, 115 Stat. 230 (2001) (codified as amended at 49 U.S.C. § 40101); *In re Sept. 11 Litig.*, 802 F.3d 314, 343 (2d Cir. 2015). In that case, the Second Circuit concluded that a federal cause of action under the ATSSSA must look to state rules concerning prejudgment interest. *Id.* Accordingly, the Second Circuit held that New York’s statutory prejudgment interest rate of nine percent as opposed to a lower rate crafted under federal law, had to be applied to the plaintiffs’ claims related to the 9/11 Attacks. *Id.*

However, more recently, in *Hoglan*, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the 4.96 percent interest rate for prejudgment interest should be applied to all of the solatium claims. ECF No. 3363 at 28-29. Judge Daniels adopted Magistrate Judge Netburn’s *Hoglan* Report in its entirety and applied the interest rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually to all of the claims. ECF No. 3384 at 6. Thereafter, in *Burnett/Iran II*, the Court again awarded prejudgment interest of 4.96 per annum, compounded annually.

In light of the Court’s decisions in *Hoglan* and *Burnett*, applying the 4.96 percent rate to prejudgment interest, the Moving Plaintiffs respectfully request that the clerk be directed to award prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually, running from September 11, 2001, until the date of the judgment.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the reasons herein, the Goldman Declaration, in the papers previously submitted to this Court in support of damages against Iran in this MDL, and as previously decided by this Court, the Moving Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Honorable Court enter an Order:

- (1) awarding the Moving Plaintiff identified in annexed Exhibit A a damages judgment in the same amount previously awarded by this Court to various similarly situated plaintiffs in *Burnett, Havlish, Ashton, Bauer, O'Neill*, and other cases; AND,
- (2) awarding solatium damages in the amount of \$12,500,000 to the Moving Plaintiff identified in annexed Exhibit A, as set forth in annexed Exhibit A; AND,
- (3) awarding the estates of the 9/11 decedents, through their personal representatives and on behalf of all survivors and all legally entitled beneficiaries and family members of such 9/11 decedent, as identified in annexed Exhibit B, awards of economic damages in the amounts set forth in annexed Exhibit B; AND,
- (4) awarding the Moving Plaintiffs pre-judgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the damages judgment; AND,
- (5) granting the Moving Plaintiffs permission to seek punitive damages, economic damages, and other appropriate damages, at a later date, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed; AND,
- (6) granting permission for all other Plaintiffs in these actions not appearing in annexed Exhibit A and Exhibit B to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed; AND,
- (7) granting to the Moving Plaintiffs such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York
May 31, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jerry S. Goldman

ANDERSON KILL P.C.

Jerry S. Goldman, Esq.

Bruce E. Strong, Esq.

Alexander Greene, Esq.

1251 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10020

Tel: (212) 279-1000

Fax: (212) 278-1733

Email: jgoldman@andersonkill.com

bstrong@andersonkill.com

agreene@andersonkill.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs